

## **REMARKS**

Currently, claims 3 and 4 are pending. Claims 1 and 2 were canceled without prejudice in this Amendment. Applicant reserves the right to file a divisional application on claims 1 and 2.

### ***Specification***

The Examiner objected to the specification in paragraphs 5-7 of the Office Action.

Applicant confirms that a typographical error was made in the application as originally filed and “Australian Patent 651408” should have read -- Australian Patent 651406 --. Applicant has replaced this reference with the United States equivalent to Australian Patent 651406, namely United States Patent No. 5,604,387.

The Examiner appears to be of the view that the present disclosure is directed to New Zealand Patent No. 236441 and not the priority document NZ332836. Applicant submits that the foreign priority claim to NZ332836 is correct which has formed the basis for United States Patent No. 6,748,618, from which the present application was divided. NZ336551 is the priority document from which granted United States Patent No. 5,604,387 is based. Applicant therefore submits that the disclosure of the present invention is directed from the correct priority document.

The Examiner also objected to the incorporation of essential material by making reference to a foreign patent on page 5, lines 24-26 and page 8, line 5. These foreign references have been replaced by the United States equivalents, namely:

- (a) United States Patent No. 4,813,248 which claims priority from NZ215389/217623/281358.
- (b) United States Patent No. 5,604,387 which is equivalent to AU651406.

Applicant has amended the title to now specify "DIRECT CURRENT POWER SUPPLY FOR A WASHING APPLIANCE".

Therefore, entry of these amendments and withdrawal of the objections to the specification is requested.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102***

Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by United States Patent No. 5,604,387 to Cheyne. Reconsideration of the rejection is requested.

Applicant submits that power supply and its control thereof as disclosed in Cheyne functions differently to that of the presently claimed invention.

Cheyne is selectively diverted by FET 7 from an energized motor winding to charge a capacitor to thereby provide a low voltage power supply in the form of a buck converter which may be subsequently used for supplying power to motor control circuitry and auxiliary devices.

In contrast, the purpose of the presently claimed invention is to use the low voltage switch to control an active switch Tx2 which effectively enables or disables a buck converter similar to the one disclosed in Cheyne. Claim 3 requires "a latching circuit which controls said active switching device to cause said commutation device to switch off to thereby disable said buck converter". Furthermore, claim 3 specifies "a push button switch for disabling said latching circuit to cause said active switching device [Tx2] to switch off to allow said one commutation switch [of the commutation device A-] to function and thereby enable said buck converter".

Although Cheyne discloses a “latching circuit” (186), the latching circuit (186) does not disable the buck converter circuit, but controls the state of FET 7 which has no effect on the operation of the buck converter, but simply enables part of the winding current to be diverted to charge the capacitor 10.

Furthermore, the Examiner has equated the user controller of Cheyne to the claimed push button switch. While Cheyne’s controller clearly receives input from at least one push button switch, that push button switch will not disable the latching circuit (186) as required by claim 3. However, even if that push button switch could disable the latching circuit, which would in turn switch off active switching device (FET 7), this would not “disable said buck converter” as required by claim 3. Switching off FET 7 simply charges capacitor 10 with winding current as has no effect on the state of the buck converter.

Therefore, Applicant submits that Cheyne does not anticipate, and further does not render obvious, claim 3. Reconsideration and allowance is requested.

• Claim 4 is dependent upon claim 3 which Applicant submits is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 4 is therefore requested.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

Applicant concurrently submits an Information Disclosure Statement for consideration by the Examiner.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims of the application are allowable over the rejections of the Examiner. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this Amendment, the Examiner is invited to contact one of the undersigned attorneys at (312) 704-1890.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated April 22, 2005

By:

Raiford A. Blackstone, Jr., Reg. No. 25,156  
Linda L. Palomar, Reg. No. 37,903

TREXLER, BUSHNELL, GIANGIORGI  
BLACKSTONE & MARR, LTD.  
105 W. Adams Street  
Suite 3600  
Chicago, Illinois 60603  
(312) 704-1890

798851